

Q

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No. EDCV 11-00918 AHM (DTBx) Date August 4, 2011

Title ANA MARIA BERNAL v. LITTON LOAN SERVICING, et al.

Present: The Honorable A. HOWARD MATZ, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen Montes	Not Reported	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.

**Attorneys NOT Present for Plaintiffs:**

**Proceedings:** IN CHAMBERS (No Proceedings Held)

On July 20, 2011, the Court granted Defendants' unopposed motion to dismiss, with leave to file an amended complaint, and ordered Plaintiff's counsel, Paul Eric St. Amant, Esq., to show cause why he should not be sanctioned \$250 for his failure to oppose the Motion or to file a notice of non-opposition in violation of Local Rule 7-9.

Mr. St. Amant responded to the Court's order on July 29, 2011. According to his response, Mr. St. Amant did not oppose Defendants' motion to dismiss because their Notice of Interested Parties did not fully disclose all interested parties, in violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1 and Local Rule 7.1-1. Thus, per Mr. St. Amant's reasoning, the motion to dismiss was invalid.

Even assuming that the Notice of Interested Parties was deficient, Mr. St. Amant was not excused from complying with Local Rule 7-9. If, in his judgment, the motion to dismiss was procedurally flawed in some manner, he should have filed a notice with the Court to that effect, rather than simply failing to reply to the motion in any manner. Nonetheless, the Court will not sanction Mr. St. Amant for his failure and DISCHARGES the order to show cause. Mr. St. Amant should review and master the Court's Local Rules and follow them scrupulously in the future.

Initials of Preparer

SMO